

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Currently, claims 1-26 stand as rejected, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection based upon the following comments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested Applicants to clarify any overlapping scope between outstanding related applications. Applicants note that the present application is not related to any other pending application. In other words, the present application does not claim priority to another outstanding application, nor are there any pending continuation or divisional applications that claim priority to the present application.

Double Patenting Rejections

1. Rejections Under Application Number 10/349,811

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 12, 15-17 and 21 of co-pending Application No. 10/349,811 (the '811 application). Applicants note that the '811 application issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,905,804. Applicants have included a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

2. Rejections Under Application Number 10/256,629

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of co-pending application 10/256,629 (the '629 application). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection based upon the following comments.

The claims of the '629 application relate to charge transport compounds having a carbazolyl nucleus. As depicted in the '629 application, a carbazolyl group is a heterocyclic group having a nitrogen atom bonded into the ring system. Thus the claims of the '629 application suggests using heterocyclic ring systems to form the nucleus of charge transport compounds. However, the '629 claims do not teach or suggest a charge transport material having a fluorenylidene group nucleus, since a fluorenylidene group is a polycyclic ring system. In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention relates to a charge transport material having

fluorenylidene group nucleus. Since the '629 application does not disclose or suggest this feature of Applicants' claimed invention, the '629 application does not render Applicants' claimed invention prima facie obvious.

Since the '629 application does not render Applicants' claimed invention prima facie obvious, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of the '629 application.

3. Rejections Under Application No. 10/243,960

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-79 of co-pending application number 10/243,960 (the '960 application). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection based upon the following comments.

The claims of the '960 application relate to charge transport materials having a nitrogen atom bonded to an A group and a B group, wherein the A group can be heterocyclic groups, naphthyl groups and B can be a hydrogen, alkyl group or an aryl group. Furthermore, the claims of the '960 patent relate to charge transport materials that comprise a single central nucleus. In other words, the compounds disclosed in the '960 application are monomer compounds. Moreover, the '960 application does not suggest linking two or more of the charge transport monomers together to form polymer compounds. In contrast, Applicants claimed invention relates to charge transport materials that are polymers having 2-6 repeating units. Since the claims of the '960 application does not teach or suggest these features of Applicants' claimed invention, the '960 patent does not render Applicants' claimed invention prima facie obvious.

Since the '960 application does not render Applicants claimed invention prima facie obvious, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the '960 application.

4. Rejections Under Application Number 10/671,255

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of co-pending application number 10/671,255 (the '255 application). Applicants have included a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate

the rejection of claims 1-26 under the double patenting rejection, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian L. Jarrells
Registration No. 53,067

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1535